

REMARKS

Claims 18 to 37 are pending in the present application. Claims 18, 25 and 31 have been amended. In view of the following, it is respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable, and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 18 to 26, 28 to 30 and 36 to 37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0194170 ("Israni").

Claim 18 relates to a method of transmitting digitally coded traffic information, in which the digitally coded traffic information is transmitted according to predetermined regulations between a transmitter and at least one receiver via at least one of a unidirectional information channel and a bidirectional information channel.

While the rejections may not be agreed with, to facilitate matters, claim 18 has been amended in accordance with the Examiner's suggestions on page 10 of the Office Action. In particular, claim 18, as presented, now recites that a subset of possible options of the predetermined regulations is defined, the options relating to at least one of a TMC message format and the ALERT-C Syntax, and that the digitally coded traffic information does not make use of all the options, and is always at least one of coded, transmitted, and decoded according to the subset.

Israni purportedly relates to a method and system for using real-time traffic broadcasts. In this regard, in paragraph [0005], Israni refers to the Radio Data System-Traffic Message Channel (RDS-TMC) as described in the 1996 version of the CENELEC END50067 specification, in which TMC messages are mentioned as one of several types of information that is transmitted via the radio data system (RDS). However, Israni does not disclose, advocate, or even suggest, to not make use of the all the options of the TMC standard, or that messages of the TMC system, without exception, should now be coded, transmitted, and decoded according to a subset of the possible message formats provided in the TMC standard, or to the ALERT-C Syntax, as required by claim 18, as presented. Accordingly, for at least these reasons Israni does not anticipate claim 18, as presented, or claims that depend either directly or indirectly from claim 18, including claims 19 to 24 and 36 to 37.

As regards claims 25, 26, and 28 to 30, Applicants note that claim 25, as presented, recites features analogous to those of claim 18, and that claims 26, 28 to 30 depend from claim 25. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Israni does not anticipate claims 25, 26, and 28 to 30 for at least the reasons stated in connection with claim 18.

In view of the foregoing, withdrawal of the anticipation rejection based on Israni is respectfully requested.

Claims 31 to 34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,070,123 (“Beyer”).

Claim 31 relates to a transmitter for conditioning and transmitting digitally coded traffic information. Claim 31, as presented, recites features substantially analogous to claim 18. In particular, claim 31, as presented, recites an arrangement for coding the digitally coded traffic information according to a subset of possible options of predetermined regulations, the options relating to at least one of a TMC message format and the ALERT-C Syntax, wherein the digitally coded traffic information does not make use of all the options.

Similar to Israni, Beyer does not disclose, or even suggest, an arrangement for coding digitally coded traffic information according to a subset of possible of options of predetermined regulations, the options relating to at least one of a TMC report format and the ALERT-C Syntax, in which the digitally coded traffic information does not make use of all the options, as required by claim 31, for at least the reason that a subset of possible options of the RDS-TMC standard or ALERT-C Syntax is not discussed or even suggested by Beyer. Accordingly, Beyer does not anticipate claim 31, or claims that depend from claim 31, including claims 32 to 34.

In view of all of the foregoing, withdrawal of the anticipation rejection based on Beyer is respectfully requested.

With respect to the rejection of claims 27 and 35 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Israni and Beyer, it is respectfully submitted that even if it were proper to modify the references as suggested (which is not conceded), Beyer does not cure the critical deficiencies of Israni (as explained above) with respect to claim 18, from which claim 27 depends, and Israni does not cure the critical deficiencies of Beyer (as explained above) with respect to claim 31, from which claim 35 depends, because both Israni and Beyer fail to disclose or suggest the analogous features of claims 18 and 35 with respect to coding digitally coded traffic information according to a subset of possible options of predetermined regulations. It is therefore respectfully submitted that claims 27 and 35 are allowable over the combination of Israni and Beyer.

In view of the foregoing, withdrawal of the rejections of claims 27 and 35 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is therefore respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims 18 to 37 are allowable. It is therefore respectfully requested that the objections and rejections be withdrawn. All issues raised by the Examiner having been addressed, an early and favorable action on the merits is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael P. Paul (Reg No 53,443)

Dated: October 11, 2006

By: *Michael P. Paul for Gerard Messina*
Gerard A. Messina
(Reg. No. 35,952)

KENYON & KENYON LLP
One Broadway
New York, New York 10004
(212) 425-7200
CUSTOMER NO. 26646